

THE KILLING SUPERALGEBRA OF TEN-DIMENSIONAL SUPERGRAVITY BACKGROUNDS

JOSÉ FIGUEROA-O'FARRILL, EMILY HACKETT-JONES,
AND GEORGE MOUTSOPOULOS

ABSTRACT. We construct the Killing superalgebra of supersymmetric backgrounds of ten-dimensional heterotic and type II supergravities and prove that it is a Lie superalgebra. We also show that if the fraction of supersymmetry preserved by the background is greater than $1/2$, in the heterotic case, or greater than $3/4$ in the type II case, then the background is locally homogeneous.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Heterotic supergravity backgrounds	2
2.1. Supersymmetric heterotic backgrounds	3
2.2. The Killing superalgebra	3
2.3. Homogeneity of heterotic backgrounds	5
3. Type IIB supergravity backgrounds	7
3.1. Supersymmetric IIB backgrounds	7
3.2. The Killing superalgebra	9
3.3. Homogeneity of IIB backgrounds	12
4. Conclusion	14
Acknowledgments	14
Appendix A. Spinors in $9 + 1$ dimensions	14
Appendix B. K preserves $G^{(3)}$ and $G^{(5)}$	16
Appendix C. A Fierz identity	18
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the major problems in supergravity is to understand how supersymmetry shapes the geometry of classical solutions to the field equations. In other words, what is the geometry of a supergravity background which preserves a given fraction of the supersymmetry? Much recent work has gone into answering this question for supergravity theories in diverse dimensions. For some of the supergravity theories in dimensions 4, 5 and 6, there is a more or less complete story [1, 2, 3, 4, 5], whereas for the ten- and eleven-dimensional supergravities the story is far from complete. At the high end of the supersymmetry fraction, there is a complete classification of maximally supersymmetric backgrounds [6] as well as non-existence results [7, 8, 9, 10] for so-called preonic backgrounds [11, 12] preserving a fraction

$\nu = \frac{31}{32}$. At the low end of the fraction, e.g., $\nu = \frac{1}{32}$, local expressions for the metric and fluxes have been derived using the various interplays between Killing spinors and differential forms: either by considering the reduction of the structure group of the manifold brought about by the existence of differential forms built out of Killing spinors, the so-called “ G -structure” approach of [13, 14], or else by thinking of spinors themselves as differential forms, in the so-called “spinorial geometry” approach of [15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

A somewhat less ambitious aim is to find general properties of backgrounds preserving less than maximal but more than minimal fractions of supersymmetry. One such property is local homogeneity. It was shown in [20] that M-theory backgrounds preserving a fraction $\nu > \frac{3}{4}$ of the supersymmetry are locally homogeneous; that is, at every point there is a frame for the tangent space consisting of flux-preserving Killing vectors. This was proven by first constructing a Lie superalgebra (termed here the *Killing superalgebra* due to the nature of its construction, to be reviewed below) associated to a supersymmetric M-theory background, along the lines traced in [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28] and then investigating the dimension of the translational component of the image of the squaring map from Killing spinors to Killing vectors.

In this paper we address this issue for the ten-dimensional supergravity theories, both type I (coupled to supersymmetric Yang–Mills) and type II. The paper is organised as follows. In §2 we discuss type I supergravity coupled to supersymmetric Yang–Mills: the theory and the Killing spinors are discussed in §2.1, whereas the Killing superalgebra and the homogeneity of sufficiently supersymmetric backgrounds is discussed in §2.2 and §2.3, respectively. In particular we show that the $\nu_c = \frac{1}{2}$ is the critical fraction above which local homogeneity is guaranteed. The more involved case of type IIB supergravity is discussed in §3. In §3.1 we discuss the theory and Killing spinors, respectively. The Killing superalgebra is constructed in §3.2, where we prove that this is indeed a Lie superalgebra. This requires checking that the Jacobi identities are satisfied. The only nontrivial identity is the odd-odd-odd identity, which is shown to hold in §3.2.2 making use of Fierz identities proven in Appendix C. The question of local homogeneity is addressed in §3.3, where we find, just as with M-theory backgrounds, that the critical fraction above which local homogeneity is guaranteed satisfies $\frac{1}{2} \leq \nu_c \leq \frac{3}{4}$. Finally, in §4 we offer some concluding remarks and in particular show how to obtain results for backgrounds of type I and IIA supergravities from the known results for heterotic and eleven-dimensional supergravities. The paper contains three appendices. In the first, Appendix A, we set out our spinorial conventions and notations. The reader is urged to read this appendix first, at least to skim the notation. The second, Appendix B, contains some of the calculations used in §3.2.1. Finally Appendix C collects the Fierz identities mentioned above.

2. HETEROTIC SUPERGRAVITY BACKGROUNDS

The field theory limit of the heterotic string [29] is ten-dimensional $N=1$ supergravity [30] coupled to $N=1$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills [31]. This

theory was constructed in [32] generalising the construction in [33] for the abelian theory.

2.1. Supersymmetric heterotic backgrounds. The bosonic fields in this theory are a ten-dimensional lorentzian metric g , the dilaton ϕ , the NS-NS 3-form H and a gauge field-strength F . In heterotic string theory the gauge group is constrained, but we will work with arbitrary gauge group in what follows. The 3-form H is assumed to be closed in the supergravity limit; although this equation receives α' corrections.

The equations of motion are obtained by varying the following action (in the string frame)

$$I = \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\phi} \left(R + 4|d\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|H|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|F|^2 \right) . \quad (1)$$

The supersymmetry parameters are chiral spinors: they are real and have sixteen components. Killing spinors satisfy three equations, a differential equation coming from the variation of the gravitino, and two algebraic equations coming from varying the dilatino and the gaugino, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} D_m \varepsilon &:= \left(\nabla_m - \frac{1}{8} H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \right) \varepsilon = 0 \\ P \varepsilon &:= \left(\partial_m \phi \gamma^m - \frac{1}{12} H_{mnp} \gamma^{mnp} \right) \varepsilon = 0 \\ Q \varepsilon &:= \frac{1}{2} F_{mn} \gamma^{mn} \varepsilon = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The connection D is metric compatible but has totally antisymmetric torsion, given by H . As these equations are linear, the set of Killing spinors is a real vector space, denoted $\mathfrak{g}_1$ and of dimension 16ν , where $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$ is the fraction of supersymmetry preserved by the background (M, g, ϕ, H, F) . A lot of progress has been made on the classification of supersymmetric heterotic backgrounds [6, 34, 18].

A Killing vector which preserves not just the metric but also ϕ and H , and which preserves F up to a gauge transformation, is said to be an infinitesimal symmetry of the background. It is clear that they too form a vector space $\mathfrak{g}_0$. More is true, however, and as they close under the Lie bracket of vector fields, they form a Lie algebra. In the next section we will show that just as in the case of M-theory backgrounds, the vector superspace $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$ carries the structure of a Lie superalgebra extending the Lie algebra structure of $\mathfrak{g}_0$.

2.2. The Killing superalgebra. In this section we construct a Lie superalgebra structure on the superspace $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$. The construction is well-known by now and has been explained in detail before [25, 20]. There are three components to the Lie bracket: the Lie bracket on $\mathfrak{g}_0$, given by restricting the Lie bracket of vector fields to the infinitesimal symmetries; the action of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ on $\mathfrak{g}_1$ given by the spinorial Lie derivative [35], and the squaring of spinors, which gives rise to the bracket $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_0$.

We begin by showing that the vector field obtained by squaring a Killing spinor is an infinitesimal symmetry.

The spin-invariant inner product on spinors has the following symmetry properties:

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^{n_1 \dots n_p} \varepsilon_2 = -(-1)^{p(p+1)/2} \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^{n_1 \dots n_p} \varepsilon_1 ,$$

whence it is symmetric for $p \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$ and antisymmetric otherwise; although if ε_i are chiral spinors of the same chirality, this will vanish unless p is odd.

Let ε be a Killing spinor and let $K^m = \bar{\varepsilon}\gamma^m\varepsilon$ denote its Dirac current. Since $D_m\varepsilon = 0$ and D is a spin connection, it follows trivially that $D_m K^n = 0$. Since D is metric-compatible, we can lower the index to obtain

$$D_m K_n = \nabla_m K_n - \frac{1}{2} H_{mnp} K^p = 0 .$$

Symmetrizing, we find that $\nabla_m K_n + \nabla_n K_m = 0$, so that K is a Killing vector, and antisymmetrizing we find that the contraction of H by K is exact:

$$K^p H_{pmn} = (dK)_{mn} . \quad (3)$$

In turn this shows that, since H is closed, $\mathcal{L}_K H = d\iota_K H = 0$. Hence H is also left invariant by K .

To show that ϕ is also left invariant, we take the inner product of the dilatino variation $P\varepsilon = 0$ with ε . There are two terms: a symmetric term with one gamma matrix and an antisymmetric term with three. This latter term vanishes by symmetry, whence we remain with

$$0 = \bar{\varepsilon} P \varepsilon = \partial_m \phi \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^m \varepsilon = K^m \partial_m \phi ,$$

which shows that K leaves ϕ invariant.

Finally we show that K leaves F invariant up to a gauge transformation. To do this we take the inner product of the gaugino equation with ε after multiplying it with a gamma matrix, to obtain

$$0 = \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_n Q \varepsilon = F_{mn} \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^n \varepsilon ,$$

after using that $\bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^{mnp} \varepsilon = 0$ by symmetry. The above equation says that the contraction of F by K vanishes, which implies that F is invariant up to gauge transformations. Indeed,

$$\mathcal{L}_K F = d\iota_K F + \iota_K dF = \iota_K dF .$$

Using the Bianchi identity $dF = -[A, F]$, where A is the corresponding gauge field, and again the fact that $\iota_K F = 0$, we see

$$\mathcal{L}_K F = -[\iota_K A, F] ,$$

which is an infinitesimal gauge transformation with parameter $-\iota_K A$. It is always possible to choose the “temporal” gauge $\iota_K A = 0$, in which F is truly invariant under K .

In summary, we have shown that K is an infinitesimal symmetry of the background. Let us remark that by the standard polarization trick, the vector $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2$, for ε_1 and ε_2 Killing spinors, is also an infinitesimal symmetry.

We now verify that the natural action of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ on $\mathfrak{g}_1$ actually preserves the space of Killing spinors. As explained, for instance, in [20], the bracket $\mathfrak{g}_0 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_1$ is given by the spinorial Lie derivative [35]

$$\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon = K^m \nabla_m \varepsilon + \frac{1}{8} (dK)_{mn} \gamma^{mn} \varepsilon ,$$

where the sign in the second term is due to the sign in the Clifford algebra. For ε a Killing spinor,

$$\nabla_m \varepsilon = \frac{1}{8} H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \varepsilon ,$$

whence using (3)

$$\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon = \frac{1}{4} K^m H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \varepsilon . \quad (4)$$

We will now show that if ε is a Killing spinor, so is $\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon$ for all $K \in \mathfrak{g}_0$. A standard property of the spinorial Lie derivative is that for any Killing vector K ,

$$\mathcal{L}_K \nabla_X \varepsilon = \nabla_X \mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon + \nabla_{[K, X]} \varepsilon , \quad (5)$$

and the same is true for D in place of ∇ provided that K also preserves H . As a consequence of this identity, the Lie derivative along $K \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ of a D -parallel spinor is again D -parallel. Furthermore, since K also preserves ϕ and F (up to gauge transformations), the Lie derivative along K of a spinor satisfying the dilatino and gaugino equations—the second and third equations in (2), respectively—will again satisfy these equations. In summary, the spinorial Lie derivative defines a linear map $\mathfrak{g}_0 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_1$.

We now have defined each of the graded pieces of the bracket $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ and it remains to show that the Jacobi identity is satisfied. This identity breaks up into types: $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0)$, $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1)$, $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1)$. All but the last are true for reasons which are more or less geometrically obvious: properties of the Lie bracket of vector fields and of the spinorial Lie derivative, as discussed in [25, 20]. The $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1)$ Jacobi identity usually has to be checked and this case is no exception. This Jacobi identity is equivalent to $[\varepsilon, [\varepsilon, \varepsilon]] = 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{g}_1$. In our geometric realisation, this is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{for all Killing spinors } \varepsilon ,$$

where $K^m = \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^m \varepsilon$ is Dirac current of ε . Since, as we have seen above, $DK = 0$, it follows from equation (4), that all we need to show is that

$$K^m H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{for all Killing spinors } \varepsilon .$$

This identity can be proven by the following simple argument. Let us rewrite the left-hand side as

$$\frac{1}{6} K^\ell H_{mnp} (\gamma_\ell \gamma^{mnp} + \gamma^{mnp} \gamma_\ell) \varepsilon ,$$

which, using the dilatino variation $P\varepsilon = 0$, can be rewritten further as

$$2K^\ell \partial_m \phi \gamma_\ell \gamma^m \varepsilon + \frac{1}{6} K^\ell H_{mnp} \gamma^{mnp} \gamma_\ell \varepsilon .$$

Since $K^m \partial_m \phi = 0$, we can further rewrite this as

$$-2K^\ell \partial_m \phi \gamma^m \gamma_\ell \varepsilon + \frac{1}{6} K^\ell H_{mnp} \gamma^{mnp} \gamma_\ell \varepsilon .$$

which vanishes because $K^\ell \gamma_\ell \varepsilon = 0$. Indeed, since both ε and K are covariantly constant with respect to the connection D , it is sufficient to prove this at a point, where it can be seen to follow from representation theory alone, as explained in Appendix A.

2.3. Homogeneity of heterotic backgrounds. In [20] it is shown that M-theory backgrounds with enough supersymmetry are (locally) homogeneous. Indeed, there is a critical fraction $\frac{1}{2} \leq \nu_c \leq \frac{3}{4}$, so that if $\nu > \nu_c$ then homogeneity is guaranteed. It is a natural question to ask whether the same holds for heterotic backgrounds. There are examples of half-BPS heterotic backgrounds which are of cohomogeneity one (see, e.g., [36]), hence we know that the critical fraction must satisfy $\nu_c \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Suppose therefore that we have a background with $\nu > \frac{1}{2}$. In particular, this means that the space of D -parallel spinors must have dimension $d > 8$. This means that the holonomy group of D must be contained in the subgroup of $\text{Spin}(1, 9)$ which fixes $d > 8$ linearly-independent spinors. The possible stabilizer subgroups of spinors come in two families [37, 34, 18, 19], whose Lie algebras are

$$\mathfrak{spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \supset \mathfrak{g}_2 \supset \mathfrak{su}(3) \supset \mathfrak{sp}(1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \supset \mathfrak{su}(4) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \supset \mathfrak{sp}(2) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \\ \supset (\mathfrak{sp}(1) \oplus \mathfrak{sp}(1)) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \supset \mathfrak{sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \supset \mathfrak{u}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \supset \mathbb{R}^8, \end{aligned}$$

along which the dimension of the subspace of invariant spinors increases from left to right: being 1 for $\mathfrak{spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8$ and 8 for either $\mathfrak{sp}(1)$ or $\mathbb{R}^8$, whence if $d > 8$ the holonomy algebra of D must be trivial, so that D must be flat. The same group-theoretical argument shows the kernel of the gaugino variation Q can be at most 8-dimensional, unless the gauge field is flat. Therefore if the space of Killing spinors has dimension > 8 , $F = 0$. By the results of [34] the background must have constant dilaton and it follows from [38] that it must be locally isometric to a Lie group with a bi-invariant lorentzian metric, whence in particular it is locally homogeneous. We conclude that $\nu_c = \frac{1}{2}$ for heterotic backgrounds.

It is natural to ask whether also here, as in eleven-dimensional supergravity, homogeneity is a direct consequence of supersymmetry. In other words, whether at every point $p \in M$, there is a basis for $T_p M$ made out of vectors from $[\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1]$. The arguments in [20, §6.2] depend on the symplectic structure of the spinor representation, which is missing in the case of chiral spinors, but nevertheless a very similar proof works after some modification.

Let us fix a point $p \in M$ once and for all. The fibre of the spinor bundle at p can be identified with the chiral spinor representation S_+ , whereas the values at p of the Killing spinors define a subspace $W \subset S_+$. The squaring map defines a map $\Phi : W \otimes W \rightarrow T_p M$ and we would like to show that this map is surjective for W of sufficiently high dimension. To show that Φ surjects onto $T_p M$, it is enough to show that the perpendicular complement of its image vanishes. A tangent vector $v \in T_p M$ is perpendicular to the image of Φ if and only if for every $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in W$,

$$v^m \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \varepsilon_2 = 0.$$

In other words, Clifford multiplication by v maps W to a subspace of S_- which corresponds to its annihilator W^0 under the natural isomorphism $S_- \cong S_+^*$ explained in Appendix A. The existence of $\frac{1}{2}$ -BPS heterotic backgrounds which are not homogeneous says that, if there is a critical dimension for W above which Φ surjects, this dimension is > 8 . Therefore without loss of generality we take $\dim W > 8$. Since $\dim W + \dim W^0 = 16$, it follows that $\dim W^0 < 8$ and hence the map $W \rightarrow W^0$ defined by the Clifford action of v has nontrivial kernel for dimensional reasons. Since $v^2 = |v|^2$ it follows that v is null, whence, up to a Lorentz transformation, we can let $v = e_+$. The Clifford relation $\gamma_+ \gamma_- + \gamma_- \gamma_+ = 2$ now says that γ_+ has rank 8. The rest of the proof now proceeds as in [20, §6.2].

Indeed, let U be a complementary subspace to W , so that $S_+ = W \oplus U$. Relative to this split, the symmetric bilinear form β on S_+ , defined by

$$\beta(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_- \varepsilon_2 ,$$

has the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^t & B \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where $A : U \rightarrow W$, $A^t : W \rightarrow U$ and $B : U \rightarrow U$ are linear maps. We know that this matrix has rank 8, since γ_- has rank 8. As in [20, §6.2], we will now estimate the maximal possible rank of β in terms of the dimension of W .

The kernel of β consists of $w + u \in W \oplus U$ such that $Au = 0$ and $A^t w + Bu = 0$. Notice that $\dim U < \dim W$, whence $\text{rank } A \leq \dim U$. In the case of maximal rank, the only solution of $Au = 0$ is $u = 0$. In this case the kernel of β consists of $w + 0$ with $w \in \ker A^t$. In other words, the dimensions of the kernels of β and of A^t agree. Since A^t and A have the same rank, A^t is onto, whence its kernel has dimension $\dim W - \dim U$. Therefore the rank of β is *at most* $16 - \dim W + \dim U = 2 \dim U$; but we know that the rank of β is 8, whence $8 \leq 2 \dim U$ or $\dim U \geq 4$. This means that if $\dim U < 4$ (equivalently, if $\dim W > 12$) no such v can exist and the squaring map Φ is surjective.

Therefore we conclude that if $\nu > \frac{3}{4}$ then the (local) homogeneity is directly due to the supersymmetry. It is still an open question whether this is necessarily the case for homogeneous backgrounds with $\frac{1}{2} < \nu \leq \frac{3}{4}$.

3. TYPE IIB SUPERGRAVITY BACKGROUNDS

We now tackle the case of type IIB supergravity backgrounds. Due to the proliferation of fields, this is computationally more involved than the case of heterotic or M-theory backgrounds. We will find that, just as in eleven-dimensional supergravity [20] and in contrast with the heterotic case treated in §2, the critical fraction of supersymmetry above which (local) homogeneity is guaranteed $\frac{1}{2} \leq \nu_c \leq \frac{3}{4}$. As in eleven-dimensional supergravity, the result could be sharpened further by the existence of a type IIB supergravity background with $\nu = \frac{3}{4}$ and which is not locally homogeneous.

In this section we will introduce the type IIB supergravity backgrounds and then construct their associated Killing superalgebra. We then show that the critical fraction for homogeneity obeys $\frac{1}{2} \leq \nu_c \leq \frac{3}{4}$ and compare our results with the few known solutions preserving that much supersymmetry.

3.1. Supersymmetric IIB backgrounds. Type IIB supergravity [39, 40, 41] is the unique 10-dimensional chiral supergravity theory with 32 supercharges. It is also the field theory limit of type IIB superstring theory.

The bosonic dynamical fields are a ten-dimensional lorentzian metric g , the dilaton ϕ , the Ramond-Ramond (R-R) gauge potentials $C^{(0)}$, $C^{(2)}$ and $C^{(4)}$ and the NS-NS 2-form gauge potential B . The axion $C^{(0)}$ and dilaton ϕ combine into the axi-dilaton $\tau = C^{(0)} + ie^{-\phi}$ taking values in the upper half-plane. The theory has a global $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ classical duality symmetry under which g and $C^{(4)}$ are inert, whereas B and $C^{(2)}$ transform as a doublet, and τ transform via fractional linear transformations on the upper-half plane.

The fermionic fields in the theory are often described as a complex chiral gravitino ψ_m and a complex antichiral axi-dilatino λ . Under the global $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ symmetry, all fermionic fields transform by appropriate phases [42, 43] corresponding to a local $\text{SO}(2)$ transformation.

We are interested in bosonic backgrounds; that is, solutions of the theory where the fermions are set to zero. The equations of motion for the bosonic fields can be found by varying an $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ invariant pseudoaction [44]. To write it down, let us combine the potentials into the following fieldstrengths:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= dB \\ G^{(1)} &= dC^{(0)} \\ G^{(3)} &= dC^{(2)} - C^{(0)}H \\ G^{(5)} &= dC^{(4)} - \frac{1}{2}dB \wedge C^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2}dC^{(2)} \wedge B . \end{aligned}$$

The RR potential $C^{(4)}$ is constrained so that $G^{(5)}$ is antiself-dual, in our conventions. In the string frame, we can write the pseudoaction as

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{IIB}} = \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} \Big\{ e^{-2\phi} \Big(R + 4|d\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|H|^2 \Big) \\ - \frac{1}{2} \Big(|G^{(1)}|^2 + |G^{(3)}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|G^{(5)}|^2 \Big) \Big\} \\ - \frac{1}{2} \int C^{(4)} \wedge dC^{(2)} \wedge dB . \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

The antiself-duality of $G^{(5)}$ must then be imposed by hand.

When discussing supersymmetry it is convenient to think of the complex fermions as doublets of real fermions, since supersymmetry does not act complex linearly. Therefore the supersymmetry parameters will be taken to be an $\text{SO}(2)$ doublet of real chiral spinors $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$. As a representation of the spin group, they transform as two copies of the chiral spinor representation S_+ . We will denote this representation by $\mathbb{S}_+ = S_+ \oplus S_+$. Such a spinor is a Killing spinor of a bosonic type IIB background if the supersymmetry variations of the the fermionic fields vanish. (Those of the bosonic fields are automatically zero because in a bosonic background the fermions have been put to zero.) The variation of the gravitino gives rise to a differential equation, whereas the equation coming from varying the dilatino is algebraic. For type IIB supergravity, a spinor $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ is Killing if it satisfies [45, 46]

$$\begin{aligned} D_m \varepsilon &:= \nabla_m \varepsilon + \frac{1}{8} H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \otimes \lambda_3 \varepsilon + \tilde{\Omega} \gamma_m \varepsilon = 0 \\ P \varepsilon &:= \left(d\phi + \frac{1}{2} H \otimes \lambda_3 + \Omega \right) \varepsilon = 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \frac{1}{8} e^\phi \left(G^{(1)} \otimes \lambda_2 - G^{(3)} \otimes \lambda_1 + \frac{1}{2} G^{(5)} \otimes \lambda_2 \right) , \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Omega = \gamma^m \tilde{\Omega} \gamma_m = e^\phi \left(\frac{1}{2} G^{(3)} \otimes \lambda_1 - G^{(1)} \otimes \lambda_2 \right) ,$$

where the 2×2 matrices λ_a , given by $\lambda_1 = \sigma_1$, $\lambda_2 = i\sigma_2$ and $\lambda_3 = \sigma_3$ span $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$. Note that in both D_m and P we have isolated the terms $\tilde{\Omega}$ and Ω coming from the RR fields, which as we will see below is a useful distinction to make.

Since the equations defining the Killing spinors are linear, the Killing spinors generate a real vector space, denoted $\mathfrak{g}_1$, of dimension 32ν , where ν is the fraction of the supersymmetry preserved by the background.

As in the case of heterotic backgrounds, an infinitesimal symmetry of a IIB background is a Killing vector which in addition to the metric, also leaves invariant the dilaton, the NS-NS 3-form H as well as the RR fields $G^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, 3, 5$. If we let $\mathfrak{g}_0$ denote the Lie algebra of infinitesimal symmetries relative to the restriction of the Lie bracket of vector fields, then in the next section we will prove the existence of a Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$ extending $\mathfrak{g}_0$.

3.2. The Killing superalgebra. In this section we will do for type IIB backgrounds what was done in §2.2 for heterotic backgrounds. Namely, we will construct a Lie superalgebra on the vector superspace $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$ which extends the Lie algebra structure on $\mathfrak{g}_0$. The additional brackets on $\mathfrak{g}$ are defined just as in the case of heterotic backgrounds: the bracket $\mathfrak{g}_0 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_1$ is the action of infinitesimal symmetries on Killing spinors given by the spinorial Lie derivative, whereas the bracket $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_0$ is the squaring operation on spinors. As before, there are several things that need to be proven. First of all, we will show that the image of the squaring map is indeed in $\mathfrak{g}_0$; in other words, that the vector field obtained by squaring a spinor is Killing and in addition leaves all the other bosonic fields in the background invariant. Then we must also show that the Lie derivative of a Killing spinor along a Killing vector in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is again a Killing spinor. Finally, we must show that the Jacobi identities are satisfied. The $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0)$ identity is precisely the Jacobi identity for the Lie bracket of vector fields on a manifold. Similarly, the $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1)$ identities follow from standard properties of the spinorial Lie derivative, as explained above and in [25, 20]. As usual, it remains to show that the $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1)$ Jacobi identity holds, and this will be shown to be the case by calculation.

3.2.1. Closure. Let $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ be a IIB Killing spinor. Let K be the vector field obtained by squaring this spinor; that is,

$$K^m := \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^m \varepsilon = \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 + \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 .$$

We will show that $K \in \mathfrak{g}_0$; that is, it is a Killing vector which leaves invariant all the bosonic fields in the background. These results can be read off from the results of [46], but we record them here for completeness.

Differentiating K , using the differential Killing spinor equation and simplifying using the Clifford algebra, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_m K_n &= \overline{\nabla_m \varepsilon} \gamma_n \varepsilon + \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_n \nabla_m \varepsilon \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} H_{mnp} K^p + \bar{\varepsilon} (\gamma_m \tilde{\Omega}^* \gamma_n - \gamma_n \tilde{\Omega} \gamma_m) \varepsilon , \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}^*$ is the symplectic adjoint of $\tilde{\Omega}$. It follows from equation (14), that $\tilde{\Omega}^* = \tilde{\Omega}$, whence

$$\nabla_m K_n = -\frac{1}{2} H_{mnp} K^p + \bar{\varepsilon} (\gamma_m \tilde{\Omega} \gamma_n - \gamma_n \tilde{\Omega} \gamma_m) \varepsilon = -\nabla_n K_m , \quad (9)$$

showing that K is a Killing vector.

To show that K preserves the dilaton, we use dilatino Killing spinor equation $P\epsilon = 0$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\epsilon}P\epsilon &= \bar{\epsilon} \left(d\phi + \frac{1}{2}H \otimes \lambda_3 + \Omega \right) \epsilon \\ &= \bar{\epsilon}d\phi\epsilon \\ &= K^m \partial_m \phi ,\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we have used the fact that $H \otimes \lambda_3$ and Ω are symplectically self-adjoint, and that for such an endomorphism A ,

$$\bar{\epsilon}A\epsilon = \overline{A\epsilon}\epsilon = -\bar{\epsilon}A\epsilon \quad \implies \quad \bar{\epsilon}A\epsilon = 0 .$$

Therefore we conclude that $K^m \partial_m \phi = 0$ and hence that K preserves the dilaton.

To show that K preserves the axion $C^{(0)}$, we must show that $K^m \partial_m C^{(0)} = 0$. To do this we again use the dilatino Killing spinor equation, but we first multiply it by λ_2 :

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\epsilon}\lambda_2 P\epsilon &= \bar{\epsilon} \left(d\phi \otimes \lambda_2 - \frac{1}{2}H \otimes \lambda_1 + \frac{1}{2}e^\phi G^{(3)} \otimes \lambda_3 + e^\phi G^{(1)} \right) \epsilon \\ &= e^\phi \bar{\epsilon}G^{(1)}\epsilon ,\end{aligned}$$

where the other terms vanish because of the self-adjointness of the endomorphisms $d\phi \otimes \lambda_2$, $H \otimes \lambda_1$ and $G^{(3)} \otimes \lambda_3$. Therefore $\iota_K G^{(1)} = 0$, which says that $K^m \partial_m C^{(0)} = 0$ as desired.

To show that K preserves H , let us introduce the vector field L defined by

$$L^m := \bar{\epsilon}(\gamma^m \otimes \lambda_3)\epsilon .$$

Differentiating L , using the differential Killing spinor equation and simplifying using the Clifford algebra, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_m L_n &= \overline{\nabla_m \epsilon}(\gamma_n \otimes \lambda_3)\epsilon + \bar{\epsilon}(\gamma_n \otimes \lambda_3)\nabla_m \epsilon \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}H_{mnp}K^p + \bar{\epsilon} \left(\gamma_m \tilde{\Omega}(\gamma_n \otimes \lambda_3) - (\gamma_n \otimes \lambda_3)\tilde{\Omega}\gamma_m \right) \epsilon ,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\tilde{\Omega}^* = \tilde{\Omega}$. Noticing that $\tilde{\Omega}\lambda_3 = -\lambda_3\tilde{\Omega}$, we can rewrite this as

$$\nabla_m L_n = -\frac{1}{2}H_{mnp}K^p + \bar{\epsilon} \left(\gamma_m \tilde{\Omega}(\gamma_n \otimes \lambda_3) + \gamma_n \tilde{\Omega}(\gamma_m \otimes \lambda_3) \right) \epsilon .$$

Antisymmetrizing, we find

$$\nabla_m L_n - \nabla_n L_m = -H_{mnp}K^p ,$$

which in the language of differential forms becomes

$$\iota_K H = -dL . \tag{10}$$

Since $dH = 0$, this shows that $\mathcal{L}_K H = 0$.

Similar but more involved calculations, which have thus been relegated to Appendix B, show that K also preserves $G^{(3)}$ and $G^{(5)}$. Therefore $K \in \mathfrak{g}_0$.

The proof that the Lie derivative of a Killing spinor along an infinitesimal symmetry $K \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ is again a Killing spinor is basically the same as the one for the heterotic backgrounds: it uses equation (5) and the fact that K preserves the other fields in the background to deduce that

$$\mathcal{L}_K D_X \epsilon = D_X \mathcal{L}_K \epsilon + D_{[K, X]} \epsilon ,$$

whence if ε satisfies the differential Killing spinor equation so does $\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon$. Similarly, since P is invariant under K , if ε obeys the algebraic Killing spinor equation, $P\varepsilon = 0$, then so does $\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon$. In summary, $\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon$ is again a Killing spinor.

3.2.2. The Jacobi identities. We now turn our attention to proving the Jacobi identities. As usual, all Jacobi identities except for the $(\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1)$ identity follows from general geometric principles. For the remaining Jacobi identity, we have to calculate. Polarising this identity, we see that it is enough to show that for all $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{g}_1$,

$$\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon = 0, \quad (11)$$

where $K^m = \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^m \varepsilon$. We prove this now.

The spinorial Lie derivative is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon = K^m \nabla_m \varepsilon + \frac{1}{4} \nabla_m K_n \gamma^{mn} \varepsilon.$$

We now use the differential Killing spinor equation in order to express $\nabla_m \varepsilon$ in terms of algebraic operations on the spinor:

$$\nabla_m \varepsilon = -\frac{1}{8} H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \otimes \lambda_3 \varepsilon - \tilde{\Omega} \gamma_m \varepsilon,$$

and equation (9) for $\nabla_m K_n$. Using the Clifford algebra and simplifying, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon = & -\frac{1}{8} K^m H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \otimes \lambda_3 \varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} H_{mnp} \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^p \otimes \lambda_3 \varepsilon \gamma^{mn} \varepsilon \\ & - \tilde{\Omega} K^m \gamma_m \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_m \tilde{\Omega} \gamma_n \varepsilon \gamma^{mn} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Breaking $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ into components and expanding $K^m = \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma^m \varepsilon$, the H -dependent terms become

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{4} H_{mnp} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \gamma^{np} \varepsilon_1 \\ \frac{1}{4} H_{mnp} \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 \gamma^{np} \varepsilon_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

Expanding the RR-terms and using that $\bar{\varepsilon}_i \gamma^m \varepsilon_i \gamma_m \varepsilon_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{8} e^\phi \begin{pmatrix} -\bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \mathbb{G}^- \gamma_m \varepsilon_2 + \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma_n \mathbb{G}^+ \gamma_m \varepsilon_1 \gamma^{mn} \varepsilon_1 \\ \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 \mathbb{G}^+ \gamma_m \varepsilon_1 + \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma_n \mathbb{G}^+ \gamma_m \varepsilon_1 \gamma^{mn} \varepsilon_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbb{G}^\pm = G^{(1)} \pm G^{(3)} + \frac{1}{2} G^{(5)}$. This can be simplified further using the Fierz identity

$$\begin{aligned} & -\bar{\alpha}_1 \gamma_m G^{(k)} \gamma_n \alpha_2 \gamma^{mn} \alpha_1 + \bar{\alpha}_1 \gamma_m \alpha_1 G^{(k)} \gamma^m \alpha_2 \\ & = (10 - 2k) \left(\bar{\alpha}_1 G^{(k)} \alpha_2 \alpha_1 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_1 \gamma^m \alpha_1 \gamma_m G^{(k)} \alpha_2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any two positive chirality spinors α_i , which is proved in Appendix C as equation (20). Indeed, using this identity we first of all see that the terms involving the RR 5-form vanish identically, whereas the rest becomes after some simplification

$$e^\phi \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \left(\frac{1}{2} G^{(3)} - G^{(1)} \right) \varepsilon_2 \varepsilon_1 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \gamma_m \left(\frac{1}{2} G^{(3)} - G^{(1)} \right) \varepsilon_2 \\ \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \left(\frac{1}{2} G^{(3)} + G^{(1)} \right) \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 \gamma_m \left(\frac{1}{2} G^{(3)} + G^{(1)} \right) \varepsilon_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

We simplify this further using the algebraic Killing spinor equation, which in components reads

$$\begin{aligned} e^\phi \left(\frac{1}{2} G^{(3)} - G^{(1)} \right) \varepsilon_2 &= - \left(\frac{1}{2} H + d\phi \right) \cdot \varepsilon_1 \\ e^\phi \left(\frac{1}{2} G^{(3)} + G^{(1)} \right) \varepsilon_1 &= \left(\frac{1}{2} H - d\phi \right) \cdot \varepsilon_2 . \end{aligned}$$

Performing the substitution and after some simplification, the expression in (13) becomes

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\bar{\varepsilon}_1 d\phi \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_1 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \gamma_m d\phi \varepsilon_1 + \frac{1}{4} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \gamma_m H \varepsilon_1 \\ -\bar{\varepsilon}_2 d\phi \varepsilon_2 \varepsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 \gamma_m d\phi \varepsilon_2 - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 \gamma_m H \varepsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} .$$

It is easy to see that the dilaton-dependent terms vanish. Indeed, for any positive-chirality spinor α ,

$$-\bar{\alpha} d\phi \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha} \gamma^m \alpha \gamma_m d\phi = 0 ,$$

using the Clifford algebra in the second term, together with the identity $\bar{\alpha} \gamma^m \alpha \gamma_m = 0$. Adding the contribution in equation (12) to the remaining terms, we find

$$4\mathcal{L}_K \varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \gamma_m H \varepsilon_1 - \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \varepsilon_1 \\ -\bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 \gamma_m H \varepsilon_2 - \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 H_{mnp} \gamma^{np} \varepsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} ,$$

which is again seen to cancel after using the Clifford algebra and the identity $\bar{\varepsilon}_i \gamma^m \varepsilon_i \gamma_m \varepsilon_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$.

3.3. Homogeneity of IIB backgrounds. In this section we consider the fraction ν_c of supersymmetry above which local homogeneity is guaranteed. The classification [6] of maximally supersymmetric solutions and the nonexistence of preonic solutions [7] puts $\nu_c \leq \frac{15}{16}$. In this section we will show that just as in eleven-dimensional supergravity $\nu_c \leq \frac{3}{4}$. Indeed, we will show that if $\nu > \frac{3}{4}$ then the background is locally homogeneous. In other words, we will show that at every point $p \in M$, there is a basis for $T_p M$ made out of vectors from $[\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_1]$. The proof is virtually identical to that of the heterotic backgrounds.

Let us fix a point $p \in M$ once and for all. The fibre of the spinor bundle at p can be identified with the chiral spinor representation $\mathbb{S}_+$, whereas the values at p of the Killing spinors define a subspace $W \subset \mathbb{S}_+$. The squaring map defines a map $\Phi : W \otimes W \rightarrow T_p M$ and we would like to show that this map is surjective for W of sufficiently high dimension. To show that Φ surjects onto $T_p M$, it is enough to show that the perpendicular complement of its image vanishes. A tangent vector $v \in T_p M$ is perpendicular to the image of Φ if and only if for every $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in W$,

$$v^m \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \varepsilon_2 = 0 .$$

In other words, Clifford multiplication by v maps W to a subspace of $\mathbb{S}_-$ which corresponds to its annihilator W^0 under the natural isomorphism $\mathbb{S}_- \cong \mathbb{S}_+^*$ explained in Appendix A. The existence of the cohomogeneity-one $\frac{1}{2}$ -BPS D3-brane background shows that, if there is a critical dimension for W above which Φ surjects, this dimension is > 8 . Therefore without loss of generality we take $\dim W > 16$. Since $\dim W + \dim W^0 = 32$, it follows that

$\dim W^0 < 16$ and hence the map $W \rightarrow W^0$ defined by the Clifford action of v has nontrivial kernel for dimensional reasons. Since $v^2 = |v|^2$ it follows that v is null, whence, up to a Lorentz transformation, we can let $v = e_+$. The Clifford relation $\gamma_+\gamma_- + \gamma_-\gamma_+ = 2$ now says that γ_+ has rank 8. The rest of the proof now proceeds as in [20, §6.2] or as in § 2.3.

Indeed, let U be a complementary subspace to W , so that $\mathbb{S}_+ = W \oplus U$. Relative to this split, the symmetric bilinear form β on $\mathbb{S}_+$, defined by

$$\beta(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_- \varepsilon_2 ,$$

has the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^t & B \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where $A : U \rightarrow W$, $A^t : W \rightarrow U$ and $B : U \rightarrow U$ are linear maps. We know that this matrix has rank 16, since γ_- has rank 16. As in [20, §6.2], we will now estimate the maximal possible rank of β in terms of the dimension of W .

The kernel of β consists of $w + u \in W \oplus U$ such that $Au = 0$ and $A^t w + Bu = 0$. Notice that $\dim U < \dim W$, whence $\text{rank } A \leq \dim U$. In the case of maximal rank, the only solution of $Au = 0$ is $u = 0$. In this case the kernel of β consists of $w + 0$ with $w \in \ker A^t$. In other words, the dimensions of the kernels of β and of A^t agree. Since A^t and A have the same rank, A^t is onto, whence its kernel has dimension $\dim W - \dim U$. Therefore the rank of β is *at most* $32 - \dim W + \dim U = 2 \dim U$; but we know that the rank of β is 16, whence $16 \leq 2 \dim U$ or $\dim U \geq 8$. This means that if $\dim U < 8$ (equivalently, if $\dim W > 24$) no such v can exist and the squaring map Φ is surjective.

As in the case of eleven-dimensional supergravity, all known IIB backgrounds with $\nu > \frac{1}{2}$ are homogeneous, whence were it not for the above result, an empirically reasonable conjecture might be that $\nu_c = \frac{1}{2}$. One way to settle this (albeit negatively) would be the existence of a IIB background admitting 24 supercharges which is *not* locally homogeneous. To date no such background has been found.

Indeed, type IIB backgrounds with 24 supersymmetries have been given in [47, 48, 49, 50, 51]. In [47] a 24 supersymmetric background was constructed by discrete quotients of the maximally supersymmetric pp-wave [27]. However, the resulting background inherits the homogeneity. In [48] (see also [49, 50]) a homogeneous pp-wave with 24 supersymmetries is given that can be obtained as a Penrose limit of a D3/D3 intersection. Only the 5-form is turned on, but it has a different structure to the maximally supersymmetric one. In [51] there are two families of homogeneous pp-waves with 24 supersymmetries.

The above examples are all homogeneous plane waves. The homogeneous plane-wave metrics are classified in [52]. It is proven in [53, §3.1] that eleven-dimensional plane waves admitting more than 16 supersymmetries are automatically homogeneous. Their argument is in fact more general and it is not hard to modify it to show that IIB plane waves with more than 16 supersymmetries are homogeneous too.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have constructed the Killing superalgebra for supersymmetric heterotic and type IIB backgrounds and have shown that it is indeed a Lie superalgebra, extending the similar result in the eleven-dimensional case. We have also shown that any heterotic background with more than 8 supersymmetries is locally homogeneous. Our proof uses the knowledge of the possible holonomy groups of the metric connection with torsion appearing in the differential Killing spinor equation. This is a result which is missing in the case of IIB supergravity, whence in this case we have to argue, as was done in [20] for eleven-dimensional supergravity, that the Killing vectors constructed from the Killing spinors act locally transitively provided that the background has more than 24 supersymmetries. The same method of proof would also show that at least 13 supersymmetries are needed in the case of heterotic supergravity. Since as we now know this result is sub-optimal, it suggests that our proof for type IIB is not yielding a sharp result and that the critical fraction for (local) homogeneity is actually lower than $\frac{3}{4}$. The same could be said about eleven-dimensional supergravity, of course. Were it not for these results, the available evidence would suggest that the critical fraction is actually $\nu_c = \frac{1}{2}$.

What about other ten-dimensional supergravities? Type I is formally identical to the heterotic case, but ignoring the gauge fields. In particular, since the differential Killing spinor equation is the same, it is easy to see that the same results apply: local homogeneity is guaranteed for backgrounds admitting more than 8 supersymmetries.

The type IIA results follow from those in [20] and show that 24+ implies local homogeneity. Indeed, a 24+ IIA background oxidises to a 24+ background of eleven-dimensional supergravity, which we know is locally homogeneous. The eleven-dimensional geometry is the total space of a locally trivial fibre bundle over the IIA geometry. The Killing spinors of the eleven-dimensional supergravity background obtained via oxidation are constant on the fibres, whence so are the Killing vectors obtained by squaring them. We know that these act locally transitively and therefore their push-downs to the base also act locally transitively. This shows that the IIA background is locally homogeneous.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We take pleasure in thanking Philipp Lohrmann for the motivation to treat the heterotic case and George Papadopoulos for useful email correspondence and for pointing out a sign error in an early draft of the heterotic case. EHJ is supported by an EPSRC Postdoctoral Fellowship.

APPENDIX A. SPINORS IN $9 + 1$ DIMENSIONS

In this appendix we set our spinorial conventions and record a number of results which are used repeatedly throughout the paper.

We work in signature $(9, 1)$ with a mostly plus metric. The Clifford product is such that $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x} = +|\mathbf{x}|^2$, whence we are working with $\text{Cl}(9, 1)$. We let

γ_m denote the corresponding gamma matrices, obeying

$$\gamma_m \gamma_n + \gamma_n \gamma_m = +2\eta_{mn} ,$$

with η_{mn} the mostly plus lorentzian inner product. As a real associative algebra, $Cl(9, 1) \cong Mat(32, \mathbb{R})$, whence there is a unique irreducible Clifford module S , which is real and of dimension 32. Under $Spin(9, 1)$, it decomposes as a direct sum $S = S_+ \oplus S_-$ of the (± 1) -eigenspaces of the volume form ω , which obeys $\omega^2 = 1$.

The natural invariant spinor inner product on S is symplectic, relative to which $S_{\pm}$ are lagrangian subspaces. Therefore as representations of $Spin(9, 1)$, S_+ and S_- are naturally dual. The spin group acts on them with determinant one, but preserves no nondegenerate bilinear form [54]. We will write this inner product as

$$(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) := \varepsilon_1^t C \varepsilon_2 = \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \varepsilon_2 ,$$

for $\varepsilon_i \in S$, where C is the charge conjugation matrix, which is antisymmetric. The action of the Clifford algebra is such that

$$(\gamma_m \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = -(\varepsilon_1, \gamma_m \varepsilon_2) ,$$

or, equivalently, $C \gamma_m = -\gamma_m^t C$. It follows from this property that the symplectic form is invariant under the spin group.

As representations of the spin group, the tensor square $S^{\otimes 2}$ of the spinor representation is isomorphic to the exterior algebra of the vector representation. In particular, for the chiral spinor representation S_+ , we find

$$S_+ \otimes S_+ \cong \Lambda^1 \oplus \Lambda^3 \oplus \Lambda_+^5 ,$$

of which the symmetric part is $Sym^2 S_+ \cong \Lambda^1 \oplus \Lambda_+^5$ and the skewsymmetric part $\Lambda^2 S_+ \cong \Lambda^3$. Globalising on a manifold, we obtain a “squaring” map from spinor fields to differential forms. Hence squaring a chiral spinor field ε we obtain a 1-form K and a self-dual 5-form Ξ , defined explicitly by

$$\begin{aligned} K_m &= \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_m \varepsilon \\ \Xi_{m_1 \dots m_5} &= \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_{m_1 \dots m_5} \varepsilon . \end{aligned}$$

Under the Clifford product, these forms annihilate the spinor ε . This can be shown directly via Fierzing or equivalence via the following representation-theoretic argument. The stabilizer $G_{\varepsilon} < Spin(9, 1)$ of a nonzero chiral spinor ε is isomorphic to $Spin(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8$, where in terms of Lorentz transformations, the $\mathbb{R}^8$ subgroup consists of null rotations around a lightlike direction. This subgroup (or a slight variant in eleven dimensions) has been explained in detail in [37]. Because the forms K and Ξ are constructed out of ε , the stabilizer G_{ε} also leaves them invariant. The invariant forms under G_{ε} are easily determined from the results in [37, Appendix A], by ignoring the ninth spatial direction e_9 . We see that there is an invariant 1-form which is null and is precisely the one along which the null rotations are defined. In our notation, this is the one-form K . Under a typical such null rotation in the Lie algebra of G_{ε} , $K^m \gamma_i \gamma_m \varepsilon = 0$, where i is a spacelike direction orthogonal to K . Since γ_i is invertible, it follows that $K^m \gamma_m \varepsilon = 0$. Similarly, the self-dual 5-form takes the form $\Xi = K \wedge \Phi$, with Φ a Cayley 4-form, and thus the Clifford product $\Xi \cdot \varepsilon = 0$ because $K \cdot \varepsilon = 0$.

In IIB supergravity, the relevant spinor representation is isomorphic to two copies of S_+ , denoted $\mathbb{S}_+ := S_+ \oplus S_+$ in this paper. The invariant symplectic structure on S extends trivially to $\mathbb{S} = S \oplus S$, relative to which $\mathbb{S}_+$ and $\mathbb{S}_- := S_- \oplus S_-$ are complementary lagrangian subspaces and hence naturally dual. There is natural action of $\text{Spin}(9,1) \times \text{GL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ on $\mathbb{S}_+$, where $\text{Spin}(9,1)$ acts separately on each summand and $\text{GL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ acts in the obvious way on pairs of spinors, but only $\text{Spin}(9,1) \times \text{O}(2)$ preserves the symplectic structure. The classical duality group $\text{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ acts via local $\text{SO}(2)$ transformations.

Many of the calculations performed in this paper require working out the symplectic adjoint of operators acting on $\mathbb{S}$. These operators are a mixture of the Clifford and $\mathfrak{gl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ actions on $\mathbb{S}$. Typically they will be linear combinations of the monomials of the form $\varphi \otimes \lambda$, where φ is a p -form and λ a 2×2 matrix. The symplectic adjoint φ^* of a p -form obeys

$$\varphi^* = (-1)^{p(p+1)/2} \varphi ,$$

whereas the adjoint of a 2×2 matrix λ is its transpose. This allows us to compute easily the symplectic adjoints of many of the terms which appear in the Killing spinor equations. Let $\lambda_1 = \sigma_1$, $\lambda_2 = i\sigma_2$ and $\lambda_3 = \sigma_3$, and let $G^{(p)}$, $p = 1, 3, 5$, be the RR p -form fieldstrengths. Then for the terms appearing in the Killing spinor equations we have

$$\begin{aligned} (G^{(1)} \otimes \lambda_2)^* &= G^{(1)} \otimes \lambda_2 \\ (G^{(3)} \otimes \lambda_1)^* &= G^{(3)} \otimes \lambda_1 \\ (G^{(5)} \otimes \lambda_2)^* &= G^{(5)} \otimes \lambda_2 \\ (H \otimes \lambda_3)^* &= H \otimes \lambda_3 , \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

whence $\tilde{\Omega}^* = \tilde{\Omega}$ and $\Omega^* = \Omega$.

APPENDIX B. K PRESERVES $G^{(3)}$ AND $G^{(5)}$

In this appendix we show that $\mathcal{L}_K G^{(3)} = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_K G^{(5)} = 0$, where $K^m = \bar{\epsilon} \gamma^m \epsilon$ is the Killing vector obtained by squaring a Killing spinor ϵ . In the main text we have already shown that K preserves H and the axi-dilaton.

To prove that H preserves $G^{(3)}$ and $G^{(5)}$, we will use identities derived in [46] for the differential forms constructed out of a Killing spinor. Let us define the following differential forms:

$$\begin{aligned} (k_{ij})_m &= \bar{\epsilon}_i \gamma_m \epsilon_j \\ (\xi_{ij}^{(3)})_{mnr} &= \bar{\epsilon}_i \gamma_{mnr} \epsilon_j \\ (\xi_{ij}^{(5)})_{mnrpq} &= \bar{\epsilon}_i \gamma_{mnrpq} \epsilon_j , \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$. In this language, the Killing vector is $K = k_{11} + k_{22}$ and the vector L introduced in §3.2.1 is given by $L = k_{11} - k_{22}$. We will use the notation $\Xi := \xi_{11}^{(5)} + \xi_{22}^{(5)}$ and $\Theta := \xi_{11}^{(5)} - \xi_{22}^{(5)}$. As explained in Appendix A, the 1-forms and 5-forms are symmetric under $i \leftrightarrow j$, whereas the 3-form is antisymmetric.

The following identity is a direct consequence of the differential Killing spinor equation [46]:

$$(dk_{12})_{mn} = \frac{1}{2}H^{rs}{}_{[m}(\xi_{12}^{(3)})_{n]rs} + \frac{1}{4}e^\phi \left(\iota_K G^{(3)} + \iota_{G^{(3)}} \Xi \right)_{mn} . \quad (15)$$

We can manipulate this identity using the algebraic Killing spinor equation. In particular, the identity $\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{mn} \otimes \lambda_1 P\epsilon = 0$ yields

$$2k_{12} \wedge d\phi + e^\phi L \wedge G^{(1)} - (\xi_{12}^{(3)})_{rs[m} H_{n]}{}^{rs} + \frac{1}{2}e^\phi \iota_{G^{(3)}} \Xi - \frac{1}{2}e^\phi \iota_K G^{(3)} = 0 ,$$

which can be inserted into (15) to yield

$$dk_{12} = -k_{12} \wedge d\phi - \frac{1}{2}e^\phi L \wedge G^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2}e^\phi \iota_K G^{(3)} ,$$

or, equivalently,

$$2d(e^{-\phi} k_{12}) = -L \wedge G^{(1)} + \iota_K G^{(3)} .$$

Differentiating again, we see that

$$d(\iota_K G^{(3)}) = dL \wedge G^{(1)} .$$

On the other hand, using the definition of $G^{(3)}$ and the fact that $\iota_K G^{(1)} = 0$, we also have

$$\iota_K dG^{(3)} = \iota_K (H \wedge G^{(1)}) = \iota_K H \wedge G^{(1)} = -dL \wedge G^{(1)} .$$

Combining the two results, we see that

$$\mathcal{L}_K G^{(3)} = \iota_K dG^{(3)} + d\iota_K G^{(3)} = 0 .$$

For $G^{(5)}$ we follow a similar procedure. The differential equation for the 3-form $\xi_{12}^{(3)}$ arising from the differential Killing spinor equation is

$$(d\xi_{12}^{(3)})_{mnpq} = \frac{1}{2}e^\phi \left(\iota_{G^{(1)}} \Xi - \iota_K G^{(5)} + \frac{1}{2}L \wedge G^{(3)} - G_{rs[m}^{(3)} \Theta_{npq]}{}^{rs} \right) + \frac{3}{2}k_{12} \wedge H + H^{rs}{}_{[m}(\xi_{12}^{(5)})_{npq]rs} .$$

We can simplify this using the algebraic Killing spinor equation. Indeed, the equation $\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{mnpq} \otimes \lambda_2 P\epsilon = 0$ can be used to rewrite the above equation as

$$d\xi_{12}^{(3)} = k_{12} \wedge H + d\phi \wedge \xi_{12}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{2}e^\phi L \wedge G^{(3)} - \frac{1}{2}e^\phi \iota_K G^{(5)} .$$

Differentiating and resubstituting the expressions for $d\xi_{12}^{(3)}$ and dk_{12} , gives

$$dL \wedge G^{(3)} - d(\iota_K G^{(5)}) + \iota_K G^{(3)} \wedge H = 0 .$$

Now, we also have

$$\iota_K dG^{(5)} = \iota_K (H \wedge G^{(3)}) = -dL \wedge G^{(3)} - H \wedge \iota_K G^{(3)} ,$$

where we have used (10) to replace $\iota_K H$. Combining the above two equations gives

$$\mathcal{L}_K G^{(5)} = \iota_K dG^{(5)} + d\iota_K G^{(5)} = 0 .$$

APPENDIX C. A FIERZ IDENTITY

Let $S = S_+ \oplus S_-$ denote the unique irreducible spinor module of $Cl(9, 1)$. As recalled in Appendix A, it is real, symplectic and of dimension 32. Any two nonzero spinors $\alpha, \beta \in S$ define a rank-1 endomorphism $\alpha \otimes \bar{\beta} : S \rightarrow S$ by

$$(\alpha \otimes \bar{\beta})(\varepsilon) = (\bar{\beta}\varepsilon)\alpha .$$

Since $Cl(9, 1) \cong \text{End}(S)$, there is a unique element of $Cl(9, 1)$ corresponding to this endomorphism. Taking traces, it is not difficult to derive the following expression for this element:

$$\alpha \otimes \bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{32} \sum_{k=0}^{10} \frac{1}{k!} (-1)^{k(k-1)/2} \bar{\beta} \gamma^{a_1 \dots a_k} \alpha \gamma_{a_1 \dots a_k} , \quad (16)$$

where we have an implicit summation over the a_i indices and where $\gamma^{a_1 \dots a_k}$ is equal to the identity for $k = 0$. We will need the special case of this identity when α, β have definite chirality.

We record here two useful Clifford identities. Firstly, the Clifford product of a p -form θ and the volume form ω defining the notion of chirality is given by

$$\theta \cdot \omega = (-1)^{p(p-1)/2} \star \theta , \quad (17)$$

where $\star \theta$ is the Hodge dual defined by

$$\theta \wedge \star \theta = |\theta|^2 \omega .$$

Similarly, for θ a p -form,

$$\gamma^m \theta \gamma_m = (-1)^p (10 - 2p) \theta . \quad (18)$$

Using identity (17), we may derive a master Fierz identity for three spinors α_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, with definite chiralities χ_1, χ_2, χ_3 , with $\chi_2 = -\chi_1$:

$$(\bar{\alpha}_1 \alpha_2) \alpha_3 = \frac{1}{32} \sum_{n=0}^5 a_{n(\chi_1 \chi_3)} \frac{1}{n!} (\bar{\alpha}_1 \gamma_{c_1 \dots c_n} \alpha_3) \gamma^{c_1 \dots c_n} \alpha_2 , \quad (19)$$

where the coefficients $a_{n(\chi_1 \chi_3)}$ are determined as follows

n	$a_{n(\pm\pm)}$	$a_{n(\pm\mp)}$
0	0	2
1	2	0
2	0	-2
3	-2	0
4	0	2
5	1	0

Finally, we use this to derive an identity used in §3.2.2 to prove the Jacobi identity for the Killing superalgebra.

Let $\alpha_{1,2}$ be two positive-chirality spinors and let $G^{(k)}$ be an k -form, where k is odd. Then the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 \gamma^{nm} \varepsilon_1 + \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \varepsilon_1 G^{(k)} \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 \\ = -(-1)^k (10 - 2k) \left(\bar{\varepsilon}_1 G^{(k)} \varepsilon_2 \varepsilon_1 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \varepsilon_1 \gamma^m G^{(k)} \varepsilon_2 \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

To prove this identity, we begin by fierzing $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 \gamma^n \gamma^m \varepsilon_1$. We do this by using the master Fierz identity (19) with $\bar{\alpha}_1 = \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m$, $\alpha_2 = G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2$ and $\alpha_3 = \gamma^n \gamma^m \varepsilon_1$. Notice that in this case, $\chi_1 = \chi_3 = +1$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 \gamma^n \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 &= \frac{1}{16} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \gamma^n \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 \\ &- \frac{1}{32} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \gamma_{pq} \gamma^n \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \gamma^{pq} G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 + \frac{1}{384} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \gamma_{pqrs} \gamma^n \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 \gamma^{pqrs} G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 . \end{aligned}$$

The third term gives zero using the trace identity (18) for a 5-form and the fact that $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma^{[3]} \varepsilon_1 = 0$ because of symmetry. For the same reason, the only contribution from the second term comes from the contraction of γ^n with γ_{pq} in the spinor inner product. Using the trace identity (18) again, we arrive at

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 \gamma^n \gamma^m \varepsilon_1 = -\frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \varepsilon_1 G^{(k)} \gamma^m \varepsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\varepsilon}_1 \gamma_m \varepsilon_1 \gamma^{mn} G^{(k)} \gamma_n \varepsilon_2 .$$

Using the Clifford algebra and the trace identity (18) once more we arrive at the desired identity.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Tod, “All metrics admitting super-covariantly constant spinors,” *Phys. Lett.* **121B** (1983) 241–244.
- [2] K. Tod, “More on supercovariantly constant spinors,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12** (1995) 1801–1820.
- [3] J. P. Gauntlett, J. Gutowski, C. M. Hull, S. Pakis, and H. Reall, “All supersymmetric solutions of minimal supergravity in five dimensions,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20** (2003) 4587–4634. [arXiv:hep-th/0209114](#).
- [4] J. Gutowski, D. Martelli, and H. Reall, “All the supersymmetric solutions of minimal six-dimensional supergravity,” [arXiv:hep-th/0306235](#).
- [5] A. Chamseddine, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, and W. A. Sabra, “Vacuum solutions of six-dimensional supergravities and lorentzian Lie groups,” [arXiv:hep-th/0306278](#).
- [6] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill and G. Papadopoulos, “Maximal supersymmetric solutions of ten- and eleven-dimensional supergravity,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **03** (2003) 048. [arXiv:hep-th/0211089](#).
- [7] U. Gran, J. Gutowski, G. Papadopoulos, and D. Roest, “ $N = 31$ is not IIB,” [arXiv:hep-th/0606049](#).
- [8] I. A. Bandos, J. A. de Azcárraga, and O. Varela, “On the absence of BPS preonic solutions in IIA and IIB supergravities,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **09** (2006) 009. [arXiv:hep-th/0607060](#).
- [9] U. Gran, J. Gutowski, G. Papadopoulos, and D. Roest, “ $N = 31$, $D = 11$,” [arXiv:hep-th/0610331](#).
- [10] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill and S. Gadhia, “M-theory preons cannot arise by quotients,” [arXiv:hep-th/0702055](#).
- [11] I. A. Bandos, J. A. de Azcárraga, J. M. Izquierdo, and J. Lukierski, “BPS states in M-theory and twistorial constituents,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 4451–4454. [arXiv:hep-th/0101113](#).
- [12] I. Bandos, J. de Azcárraga, J. Izquierdo, M. Picón, and O. O Varela, “On BPS preons, generalized holonomies and $D=11$ supergravities,” *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 105010. [arXiv:hep-th/0312266](#).

- [13] J. P. Gauntlett and S. Pakis, “The geometry of $D = 11$ Killing spinors,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **04** (2003) 039. [arXiv:hep-th/0212008](#).
- [14] J. P. Gauntlett, J. Gutowski, and S. Pakis, “The geometry of $D=11$ null Killing spinors,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **12** (2003) 049. [arXiv:hep-th/0311112](#).
- [15] U. Gran, J. Gutowski, and G. Papadopoulos, “The spinorial geometry of supersymmetric IIB backgrounds,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** (2005) 2453–2492. [arXiv:hep-th/0501177](#).
- [16] U. Gran, J. Gutowski, and G. Papadopoulos, “The G_2 spinorial geometry of supersymmetric IIB backgrounds,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 143–206. [arXiv:hep-th/0505074](#).
- [17] U. Gran, J. Gutowski, G. Papadopoulos, and D. Roest, “Systematics of IIB spinorial geometry,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 1617–1678. [arXiv:hep-th/0507087](#).
- [18] U. Gran, P. Lohrmann, and G. Papadopoulos, “The spinorial geometry of supersymmetric heterotic string backgrounds,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **02** (2006) 063. [arXiv:hep-th/0510176](#).
- [19] U. Gran, G. Papadopoulos, D. Roest, and P. Sloane, “Geometry of all supersymmetric type I backgrounds,” [arXiv:hep-th/0703143](#), 2007.
- [20] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, P. Meessen, and S. Philip, “Supersymmetry and homogeneity of M-theory backgrounds,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** (2005) 207–226. [arXiv:hep-th/0409170](#).
- [21] B. S. Acharya, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, C. M. Hull, and B. Spence, “Branes at conical singularities and holography,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 1249–1286. [arXiv:hep-th/9808014](#).
- [22] J. P. Gauntlett, R. Myers, and P. K. Townsend, “Supersymmetry of rotating branes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 025001. [arXiv:hep-th/9809065](#).
- [23] J. P. Gauntlett, R. Myers, and P. K. Townsend, “Black holes of $D = 5$ supergravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999) 1–21. [arXiv:hep-th/9810204](#).
- [24] P. K. Townsend, “Killing spinors, supersymmetries and rotating intersecting branes,” in *Novelties in string theory (Göteborg, 1998)*, pp. 177–182. World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1999. [arXiv:hep-th/9901102](#).
- [25] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, “On the supersymmetries of Anti-de Sitter vacua,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999) 2043–2055. [arXiv:hep-th/9902066](#).
- [26] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill and G. Papadopoulos, “Homogeneous fluxes, branes and a maximally supersymmetric solution of M-theory,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **06** (2001) 036. [arXiv:hep-th/0105308](#).
- [27] M. Blau, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, C. M. Hull, and G. Papadopoulos, “A new maximally supersymmetric background of type IIB superstring theory,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **01** (2002) 047. [arXiv:hep-th/0110242](#).
- [28] N. Alonso-Alberca, E. Lozano-Tellechea, and T. Ortín, “Geometric construction of Killing spinors and supersymmetry algebras in homogeneous spacetimes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** (2002) 6009–6024. [arXiv:hep-th/0208158](#).
- [29] D. Gross, J. Harvey, E. Martinec, and R. Rohm, “The heterotic string,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985) 502–505.
- [30] A. Chamseddine, “ $N=4$ supergravity coupled to $N=4$ matter,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B185** (1981) 403–415.
- [31] L. Brink, J. Schwarz, and J. Scherk, “Supersymmetric Yang–Mills theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B121** (1977) 77–92.
- [32] G. Chapline and N. Manton, “Unification of Yang–Mills theory and supergravity in ten dimensions,” *Phys. Lett.* **B120** (1983) 105–109.
- [33] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, B. de Wit, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Ten-dimensional Maxwell–Einstein supergravity, its currents, and the issue of its auxiliary fields,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B195** (1982) 97–136.
- [34] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, T. Kawano, and S. Yamaguchi, “Parallelisable heterotic backgrounds,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **10** (2003) 012. [arXiv:hep-th/0308141](#).
- [35] Y. Kosmann, “Dérivées de Lie des spineurs,” *Annali di Mat. Pura Appl. (IV)* **91** (1972) 317–395.

- [36] M. J. Duff, R. R. Khuri, and J. X. Lu, “String solitons,” *Phys. Rep.* **259** (1995) 213–326. [arXiv:hep-th/9412184](#).
- [37] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, “Breaking the M-waves,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17** (2000) 2925–2947. [arXiv:hep-th/9904124](#).
- [38] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, “On parallelisable NS-NS backgrounds,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20** (2003) 3327–3340. [arXiv:hep-th/0305079](#).
- [39] J. Schwarz, “Covariant field equations of chiral $N=2$ $D=10$ supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B226** (1983) 269.
- [40] J. Schwarz and P. West, “Symmetries and transformations of chiral $N=2$ $D=10$ supergravity,” *Phys. Lett.* **B126** (1983) 301–304.
- [41] P. Howe and P. West, “The complete $N=2$ $d=10$ supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B238** (1984) 181–220.
- [42] T. Ortín, “ $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ duality covariance of killing spinors in axion-dilaton black holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 790–794. [arXiv:hep-th/9404035](#).
- [43] A. Sen, “String network,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **03** (1998) 005. [arXiv:hep-th/9711130](#).
- [44] E. Bergshoeff, H. J. Boonstra, and T. Ortín, “S duality and dyonic p -brane solutions in type II string theory,” *Phys. Rev.* **D53** (1996) 7206–7212. [arXiv:hep-th/9508091](#).
- [45] E. A. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, S. F. Kerstan, and F. Riccioni, “IIB supergravity revisited,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **08** (2005) 098. [arXiv:hep-th/0506013](#).
- [46] E. J. Hackett-Jones and D. J. Smith, “Type IIB Killing spinors and calibrations,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **11** (2004) 029. [arXiv:hep-th/0405098](#).
- [47] J. Michelson, “(Twisted) toroidal compactification of pp-waves,” *Phys. Rev.* **D66** (2002) 066002. [arXiv:hep-th/0203140](#).
- [48] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, and C. Pope, “Penrose limits, pp-waves and deformed M2-branes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 046003. [arXiv:hep-th/0203082](#).
- [49] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, and C. Pope, “M-theory pp-waves, Penrose limits and supernumerary supersymmetries,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B644** (2002) 65–84. [arXiv:hep-th/0203229](#).
- [50] J. P. Gauntlett and C. M. Hull, “pp-waves in 11-dimensions with extra supersymmetry,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **06** (2002) 013. [arXiv:hep-th/0203255](#).
- [51] I. Bena and R. Roiban, “Supergravity pp solutions with 28 and 24 supercharges,” [arXiv:hep-th/0206195](#).
- [52] M. Blau and M. O’Loughlin, “Homogeneous plane waves,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B654** (2003) 135–176. [arXiv:hep-th/0212135](#).
- [53] M. Blau, P. Meessen, and M. O’Loughlin, “Gödel, Penrose, anti-Mach: extra supersymmetries of time-dependent plane waves,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **09** (2003) 072. [arXiv:hep-th/0306161](#).
- [54] F. Harvey, *Spinors and calibrations*. Academic Press, 1990.

MAXWELL INSTITUTE AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH,
UK